

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,593	10/17/2003	Peter Sibbett	59228-8003.US01	9368
37815 DEDVING COI	7590 01/29/2007	EXAMINER .		
PERKINS COIE LLP BOX 2168			CULBERT, ROBERTS P	
MENLO PARK, CA 94025			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1763	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/29/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/686,593	SIBBETT, PETER				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Roberts Culbert	1763				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	<u> </u>	<u> </u>				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the specified above, the specified above, the specified above above the specified above above the specified above, the specified above above the specified above the specified above above the specified above above the specified above the spe	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	1					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 Ja	anuary 2007.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
·— · · ·						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r. '	,				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	1					
Attachment(s)	_					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Uther:						

Application/Control Number: 10/686,593

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/4/07 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/4/07 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive to overcome the rejections of the previous Office Action.

Applicant has argued that as it is "sprayed" the mesh is a liquid material. However, there is no support for the argument since spraying may be performed with liquid and non-liquid materials.

Applicant has argued that the specification teaches that the predetermined mesh is first transferred onto the entire etching area of the mold using the spraying method and the etching area of the mold is then etched with chemicals selected in accordance with the mold materials and the mesh, and that the mesh forming process is performed to express the texture of wood on the door. However, none of the teachings address what the "mesh" is, how it is applied by spraying method, how the "etching area" of the mold is etched, since the mesh is "transferred onto the entire etching area", or how the mesh process forms a wood grain texture.

Applicant has argued "The mesh is transferred, i.e. sprayed, onto the door mold, in only the etching area, as is the subsequent etching step, due to the previous pattern forming process in which the non-etching area of the door mold was precisely masked." However, although the argument explains that the non-etching area remains protected, the argument does not address how the "etching area" of the mold is etched after transferring the mesh since the mesh is transferred onto the entire etching area.

Application/Control Number: 10/686,593

Art Unit: 1763

Applicant has argued that the ordinary meaning of the word "mesh" contemplates the disclosed layer of liquid material scattered by spraying. The argument is not persuasive since there is no support in the specification or in the ordinary meaning of the word "mesh" for a "liquid" or a material that is "scattered".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim 1 recites a mesh forming process comprising transferring a mesh onto the etching area using a spraying method, but does not explain what the "mesh" is, how it is applied by spraying method, how the "etching area" of the mold is etched, since the mesh is "transferred onto the entire etching area", or how the mesh process forms a wood grain texture.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, recites a mesh forming process comprising transferring a mesh onto the etching area using a spraying method, but does describe the process. The term "mesh" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide even a remote definition, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably appraised of the scope of the invention.

Art Unit: 1763

Claims 1-6 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, elements and structural relationships between elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the method steps. See MPEP § 2172.01.

As recited above, claim 1, recites a mesh forming process comprising transferring a mesh onto the etching area using a spraying method, but does describe the process. Further since the "mesh" is not an art recognized term, the limited description precludes a reasonable search of the prior art by the examiner.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberts Culbert whose telephone number is (571) 272-1433. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on (571) 272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

R. Culbert Examiner Art Unit 1763

i